

REMARKS

Claims 1, 2, 4-6, 8, 10-14, 20, 22, 23 and 47 are now pending in the application. Claims 7 and 44-46 have been cancelled. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 112

Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as the invention. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 7 has been cancelled, rendering the rejection moot.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. §§ 102 AND 103

Claims 1, 2, 5 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Poet et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 2004/0255745 A1). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claim 6 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poet et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 2004/0255745 A1) in view of Sartori (U.S. Pat. No. 6,578,460 B2). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 7, 12-14, 20 and 47 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poet et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 2004/0255745 A1) in view of Hammond (U.S. Pat. No. 2,163,320). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 10 and 11 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poet et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 2004/0255745 A1) in view of Lantz (U.S. Pat. No. 1,465,224). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Claims 22 and 23 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Poet et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 2004/0255745 A1) in view of Vogl et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 3,249,134). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

At the outset, Applicants note that claims 1, 13, and 22 have been amended to include matter indicated as allowable by the Examiner. Therefore, the rejections of claims 1, 13, and 22 under §§102 and 103 have been rendered moot.

ALLOWABLE SUBJECT MATTER

The Examiner states that claims 4 and 44-46 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form. Accordingly, Applicants have amended claims 1, 13, and 22 to include the features of claims 44-46. Therefore, claims 1, 13, and 22 should now be in condition for allowance. Claims 2, 4-6, 8, 10-12, and 47 depend from claim 1 and claims 14 and 20 depend from claim 13, and should therefore be in condition for allowance for the reasons set forth above.

CONCLUSION

It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office

Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested. If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 12-26-07

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

RWM/JMP/jd

By: Ryan W. Massey
Ryan W. Massey, Reg. No. 38,543